

~~SECRET~~

0356/7-11

COPY 1 OF 3 COPIES

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

17th Meeting

26 January 1956

DCI Conference Room, Admin Building

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☐
☐ DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S 2011
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE: 24/06/81 REVIEWER: 018995

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

17th Meeting

26 January 1956

DCI Conference Room, Admin Building

Present

Harrison G. Reynolds
Director of Personnel
Chairman

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Special Support Assistant to DD/S
Alternate for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Chief, Administrative Staff, OC
Alternate for Director of Communications, Member

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General
Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Acting Director of Training
Alternate for Director of Training, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Assistant to the DD/I (Admin)
Alternate for DD/I, Member

Lawrence K. White
Deputy Director (Support)
Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Reporter

Guests

25X1A9a Lawrence R. Houston, General Counsel
[REDACTED] r., Office of General Counsel
[REDACTED] Executive Officer, Office of Personnel

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
I-N-D-E-X

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Page
1.	Approval of Minutes of 16th Meeting	1
2.	"Reduction in Force in relation to Membership in the Career Staff" - oral presentation by Mr. [REDACTED]	2
25X1A9a	Diagram used - See <u>Attachment 1</u>	
	OTR comments on New Fitness Report - read by Chairman	8
3.	"Proposal for Development of Language Proficiencies and Incentives Therefor" - oral presentation by Colonel Lawrence K. White	8
4.	"Selection of Candidates for the War Colleges" - recommended by Defense Colleges Selection Panel .	11
5.	New Business:	
	Proposed agenda items for future meetings	18
	Memo for DCI re Supergrade Evaluations.	19
	Adjournment	19

~~SECRET~~

. . . . The 17th meeting of the CIA Career Council convened at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, 26 January 1956, in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Harrison G. Reynolds presiding

MR. REYNOLDS: The meeting will please come to order.

The minutes of the 16th meeting are attached to your agenda for this meeting, for your approval. Are there any errors or omissions?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have a correction. On page 2, paragraph 2, the third word should be "discussed," not "dismissed." The Council did not dismiss the problem of using separate versions of the Regulation.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is correct.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And then I would recommend adding to the last sentence to that paragraph on the top of page 2 - "The Council disapproved the issuance of an announcement Notice for either Headquarters or the field, believing one Regulation would suffice." I believe that makes it clear.

MR. REYNOLDS: With those two changes--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There is another typographical error on page 2 in subparagraph "e." Isn't that "living allowances" rather than "bring allowances"?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, it's living allowances.

MR. REYNOLDS: With these corrections and comments the minutes stand approved.

25X1A9a As the second item on the agenda, Mr. [REDACTED], the Executive Officer of the Office of Personnel, will make an oral presentation entitled "Reduction in Force in relation to membership in the Career Staff."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We had a discussion of this matter of how the reduction in force regulations of the Government might apply to the Agency, in the Selection Board some-time ago, and it was thought that the Council might have an equal interest in it.

What is my limit on time here?

MR. REYNOLDS: You have all the time you want today, Charlie, because we have a short agenda.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have not, here in the Agency, produced a reduction in force regulation. We have the skeleton of one, should we ever need it, but up to now it has not been felt that there was any valid purpose to be served by going through all the stress and strain of producing a regulation when there was so little likelihood that we would need it. But against the time that we might, as I say, we have put a skeleton of a regulation on ice, and we have done quite a bit of talking with the Civil Service

~~SECRET~~

Commission with respect to whether or not our concept of a Career Service fits in with the Commission's ideas of relative positions on a reduction in force register.

I think probably this is best explained by an illustration. So let's assume, first of all, that within the concept of reduction in force, should it have to be made, we determine the competitive area of the reduction would be the world. To give you an example of the differences there, within an organization such as the Department of Agriculture it is quite possible--and is the usual thing--that all regional offices of the Department of Agriculture would constitute separate competitive areas, so that the people in Atlanta, for example, wouldn't be in competition with the people in San Francisco. But they have somewhat of a different situation there, as we view it. So if you will assume, then, that our competitive area should be the world, that is a basic step in this procedure.

Let me give an example. Say we had to reduce our commo technicians by fifty GS-7's, as we view it it would be more equitable to reduce them world-wide than to try to do it just around headquarters; or, if you had only five to reduce because the station at [REDACTED] was going to be wiped off, it would be inequitable to just eliminate those people without reference to all the others in the Commo Service. That is why we think the competitive area should be the world.

The next step in a reduction in force, of course, is determining where you must make your reduction. Take, for example, that we are going to reduce in the area of Administrative Assistants, grade GS-9's. Then we would work it out something like this [indicating on blackboard]: "COMPETITIVE AREA - WORLD-WIDE." Now the area in which we are going to make the reduction is called the "Competitive Level" and that is what we are saying here is "Administrative Assistant - GS-9." Let's assume we have to reduce ten people who hold this kind of a job designation. We would have to take all of the people in the Agency who hold this job title and this job designation, and who are performing the same general types of work, and rank them one against the other. Let's take, for example, that the man on top of our list is, first of all, in category "I" - which means that he is a permanent member of the Government. By that we mean he has passed a trial period and he has passed the 3-year Career Service requirement with the Agency. So we call him a "Category I." And we put "A" here [indicating on blackboard] to designate that he is a veteran. Then we would indicate the number of total years' service, and in this case we will make it five years. Now this man would be on top of the list, and it would mean he was a permanent member of the Government, a veteran, and a member of the Career Staff.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Question: Is that 5 years of service in the Government or in CIA?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Total years of service in Government, including his military service.

Now, let's take the next man on the list. He is also a permanent man. This time, however, he is a non-veteran. Let's assume he has 8 years of service. Then the only difference here is the fact that one is a veteran and the other is a non-veteran. But the fact that this man is a veteran, ranks him ahead of the man with 8 years' service. Now there is a bill presently in Congress--on which the Agency will comment--which, after 5 years, would take away from a veteran this right that is vested in him at the present time to go ahead of all non-veterans; in other words, for the first 5 years after a man's return from military service he would enjoy this extra benefit, but after 5 years of civilian service he would lose it, and then he would be in the same status as non-veterans. We in the Office of Personnel have taken a favorable position toward that piece of legislation, and I presume the Agency will pass that forward.

Now we come to the second group, which we have called "Category II" - and here we say this first man is a veteran with 11 total years of service. In this case we are saying that we have a man who is in his trial period, as opposed to the man who has completed the three years, and is a member of the Career Staff. He is in his trial period, he is a veteran, but he is not in the Career Staff yet because he obviously hasn't had enough Agency service to qualify. Notice that this man with 11 years, then, is below the veteran. Take another example of a person who is a veteran with say 9 years of service and who could be "permanent" in the sense of having completed his trial period and his 3 years in the Agency but he was non-Career Staff, assuming he either passed it by and wouldn't sign up for it, or for some reason he was rejected. Notice here that he is taking a definitely subordinate position, even though he has greater years of service.

The next person in line would be, say, a non-veteran, which we put in the "B" category, with say 12 years of service. This fellow is in his trial period, a non-veteran, and not in the Career Service. And the next one is a non-veteran, who has 10 years of service, is permanent, and who has passed up the Career Service or it passed him up.

There is only one other category and that would be your temporaries, and it wouldn't matter how many years of service they had.

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

The differences, as you can see here on the diagram, are in the rankings of the veteran. Now we have this veteran pushed down here because even though he is a permanent veteran he is non-Career Staff, and that puts him in this second category. That is the major difference here; otherwise this fellow would be up here in the first category.

COLONEL WHITE: What you are trying to get at--isn't it?--is whether being a member of the CIA Career Staff or not will stand up if you put it to the test.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have found that it will, by our discussions with the Commission.

COLONEL WHITE: Then that is all we want to know.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: They have assured us they would honor this sort of ranking.

COLONEL WHITE: In other words, we have taken the standard reduction in force procedure and added to it whether or not he is a member of the Career Staff, and, if not, then he goes below.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is right. Now what we are doing in the sense of requiring a 1-year trial period and a 3-year period of service to qualify for the Career Staff, is no different than the Government is requiring, generally, in a 1-year trial period and a total of three years before they are made an absolute careerist. Under the normal practices in the rest of Government you come in as a "career conditional" employee and you stay in that category until the expiration of three years and positive action by the agency to make you a careerist. Now it follows the same pattern that we have. So, 25X1A9a as [REDACTED] found, in several discussions with people in the Civil Service Commission, that what we wanted to do should we get into a reduction in force, by giving credit to the Career Service man, would stand up by their interpretation of relative rankings.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Charlie, supposing you have a conflict between veteran status and Career Staff status; in other words, does a veteran with Career Staff status, with the same rating in other factors, come out ahead of a non-veteran with Career Staff status?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, he would, for this very reason right here. Here is a man with five years' service, a veteran and a member of the Career Staff, who would rank above this fellow here who has nine years' total service, is permanent and is a veteran.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And I-A-5, the permanent veteran and a member of the Career Staff, ranks ahead of I-B-8, who is permanent but a non-veteran.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

Now in making a reduction if you listed all these people in this category you might have 100 or 200, and you had to reduce 20, you would start at the bottom and chop off the 20 at the bottom.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Where does performance enter in? We always felt that was very important.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Performance is not recognized, in this system, as such. Under the old system that used to be in effect if you had an "excellent" rating you got an extra five points. But, first of all, we don't have a method of giving an adjective rating. So we would confine ourselves to total years of service on the assumption, first of all, that if you have unsatisfactory people you will have taken steps to get rid of them under regular processes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Under the Commission's regulations you must have "satisfactory" or better to be entitled to veterans' preference. So the unsatisfactory man would go to the bottom of the list.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Nobody has these preferences based on performance any longer, because the Government doesn't have that system - isn't that correct?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The Government at large has "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory." As Dick says, if you are unsatisfactory and in the process of being separated at some point, you would go at the bottom.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have something which is not too far from that--in unsatisfactory ratings--in the withholding of step increases. Anybody in that category would go to the bottom of your list, would he not? Could we not add that as a factor?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I would think that is a proper factor.

MR. REYNOLDS: In the event of this legislation passing, however, that man would be above the I-A man.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If it passes these two people [I-A-5 and I-B-8] would be reversed.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: By reason of the difference between five and eight years of service. Up to five years' service the veteran would be ahead, and after that he would rank with the non-veteran.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Maybe this isn't a good example here. Maybe to make it better we should say this fellow had 10 and this other one had 12. That would be more nearly the case, if we include military service and, say, five years' civilian

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

service. But that legislation has a long way to go, and I seriously doubt whether it will pass.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Off-hand it looks illogical for the permanent veteran to be outranked by the non-veteran in II-A-9 and I-B-8.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The only difference is in years of service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The permanent veteran had an opportunity to become a member of the Career Staff, whereas the trial veteran hasn't completed the necessary service and had an opportunity to become a Career Staff member.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Our feeling was that because they were in the same category here, neither one of them being in the Career Staff, they had to take rank among themselves on the basis of years of service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In earlier discussions I think it was developed that "permanent" as put there, is really not a status. The so-called "career status" that one gets in the Civil Service requires action by the agency. The only column on your diagram there that refers to action by the Agency, is the Career Staff. So the permanent man doesn't have anymore papers in his folder than the trial man, except he has been here at least three years.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes. When we say "permanent" we really mean that he has satisfied the trial period of one year in the Federal service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: To follow up on my previous question, is there any way that the office would enter in performance, if they had someone they considered very excellent or outstanding, yet perhaps with one year less than the average employee, or some other technicality. Is there any way that could enter into this consideration?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, that is possible under the most rigid system. If the office can show that one man is far more qualified than the others, it is a matter which can be considered by the appointing officer in determining whether or not it shall be that person rather than the one above him. The decision of the appointing officer, though, where you are dealing with the Veterans' Preference Act, can sometimes get a little sticky, because the appointing officer could be fully in accord with you but he might be reversed on an appeal to the Civil Service Commission, which the veteran would have a right to do. But the Commission is not so sticky on it that they won't listen. But there is a possibility of reversal.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: From a practical standpoint, Charlie, since the estimate that we have now is that only 65% will be members of the Career Staff--of course, that is across the board and doesn't mean in any one category--wouldn't it mean that a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

reduction in force would always eliminate those who had less than three years and who were therefore not members of the Career Staff, before you reached members of the Career Staff, unless in a particular group--for example, in this administrative assistant category, GS-9's, if everybody in it was already a member of the Career Staff then it would be a question of veteran versus non-veteran.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is correct. It would take months to rank everybody on their longevity computation dates when they got on the register.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] And the longevity then becomes your controlling factor.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is right, at the present time, whether you have veterans' preference or not.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Longevity is more of a factor than performance, under the Veterans' Preference Act.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It is at this point.

MR. REYNOLDS: Any further questions, gentlemen? 25X1A9a

MR. HOUSTON: Could I ask a related question? In the [REDACTED] case we had up for discussion, and I don't remember it being settled, whether a job requiring special clearance was in competition with the same job that didn't require special clearance.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Yes, we felt that we could--

MR. HOUSTON: Was a firm decision made?

25X1A9a X MR. [REDACTED]: We took a firm position on it, Larry, on the basis that in order to qualify for the competitive level you must have interchangeability between all the jobs in this area based on the qualifications required for the actual duties and the responsibilities of the job. Now one of the qualifications--an essential qualification--of the job was an SI clearance. So we said, and we were ready to battle that one out, and the Commission told us informally that was all right.

MR. HOUSTON: That is the main thing.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] The Commission did face up to that question at the time. It is an essential qualification for a job.

MR. REYNOLDS: Any further questions, gentlemen?

Thank you, very much, Charlie.

MR. HOUSTON: There were some ramifications on the technical legal aspects, but I don't think we need to go into that in any detail. Part of it had to do with counting military service with length of service. Of course, the basic question of

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

whether we are under the Veterans' Preference Act may be disputable legally. But I think we will certainly not contest veterans' rights, and therefore the Civil Service Commission thought--and I think they're right--that military service should go toward the three years. But if you had a case where a man had three years' military service and we had him only for one month, and that completed his three years, at that time you didn't have to admit him to the Career Staff. You could say, "We don't know enough about you." But the point involved, and I think [REDACTED] raised this point, 25X1A9: was that we don't think you should postpone consideration of the man to exactly the time when he completes his three years' civilian service, because then you are clearly vitiating your claim that you are giving him the right to include military service. I think Dick discussed with Rud that whenever you postpone anyone you postpone him for say six months.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is what the Selection Board is in fact doing. We are making sure the date doesn't coincide with the exact critical date of 3 years' service.

✓ | MR. HOUSTON: Otherwise we can keep these separate areas between career and non-career.

✓ MR. REYNOLDS: Gentlemen, I have a note here which is of interest and I will read it into the record. [Reading]

25X1A9a "The Office of Training conducted the seminars planned by the Council in connection with launching the new Fitness Report. Dr. [REDACTED], Chief, Assessment and Evaluation Staff, addressed about 80 key operating officials and their deputies, and Mr. [REDACTED], Chief, Management Training, conducted 9 seminars for about 100 key administrative and personnel officers throughout the Agency. Mr. [REDACTED] has prepared a very valuable report which will be studied jointly by the Office of Personnel and the Office of Training in connection with the research which the Council authorized on the Fitness Report for the ensuing year. The following excerpts from Mr. [REDACTED] report are significant:

"The meeting showed that the present instructions are highly adequate . . ." - they " . . . indicate that there is a rapidly crystallizing opinion within the Agency which now willingly accepts and can shortly become enthusiastic in support of the new Fitness Report." "If supervisors are given this guidance [by those who were indoctrinated] the inherent virtues of the Fitness Report will win for it widespread support and general respect in its use."

✓ MR. REYNOLDS: Colonel White, would you like to make a few preliminary remarks on item 3, the proposal for the development of language proficiencies?

× COLONEL WHITE: About three weeks ago at a Deputies' Meeting the Director again expressed his strong desire to have something done in the way of further development of language competence and, as a matter of principle, paying some sort of cash incentive. This he has expressed on two or three other occasions during the past year,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

and we have discussed it on various levels. I don't know whether it has actually been brought to the Career Council or not, but each time it came up it was such a complicated problem and there was such wide disagreement as to whether we should do this, and, if so, how, that it sort of died a-borning. And this last time it came up the Director was very forceful in his expression that he was tired of waiting for something to be done about this and he wanted something to be done about it, period. So I then constituted a task force, and I have met with them twice and have been in informal touch with them right along, to study the problem - not fight the problem as to whether we were going to do it but study HOW to do it. I gave a two-week deadline to come up with something, and in two weeks they had something but I didn't feel it was ready to present because there was substantial disagreement among the members of the task force as to many of the policy questions, which I feel have to be answered by the Director before we can implement it.

Some of the questions, without trying to go into all of them, were: How do you develop an inventory of what we have? How do you develop the requirements as to what we need? How much do you pay? Do you pay the same for all languages, or how do you distinguish between the easy ones and the more difficult ones, and the ones in short supply and the ones in plenty? How do you compensate a man who has multiple competency, as opposed to only one language? Do you distinguish between the man who learns a language on his own and at his own expense? Do you distinguish between that individual and the man who learns it on Government time and at Government expense? Do you and HOW do you distinguish between the man whose grade level is established because of a language requirement, and one who needs the language requirement only incidental to his assignment? Do you distinguish between the departmental employee, on the one hand, and the overseas or case officer type on the other? When is this effective? Do you go back to 1947, not to pay retroactively, but do you start paying now for a language competence gained prior to this, or do you start now?

The task force was in such disagreement on many of these points-- although I think they had raised them and considered them--that I felt what they had come up with was too much the "least common denominator" and left too many what I considered major policy questions, to be administered by the Deputy Director, Support, and the Director of Training. So I asked them to go back and do some more work on it, and to present not only a proposed regulation but a staff study giving the pro's and con's of these points, and if they couldn't agree, then that was all right, but not to have the least common denominator.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

I hope to have something on this within the next few days, and in view of the Director's strong feeling on the subject I think we ought to call a special meeting of the Council to consider it when it is ready.

Now I think Larry may want to say something about the legality of this sort of system, which he has been looking into along with this task force.

MR. HOUSTON: Yes. The more we studied the paying on this basis the more doubtful it became to us whether it was really an incentive awards authority. And since this is going to be Agency-wide we see no reason why it should be an unvouchered transaction. So we felt the thing to do was to talk to the Comptroller General's Office about it. We have had a couple of discussions with him, and the upshot is that they believe, also, it is not clearly within the incentive authorities but may be within our own wide authorities for the expenditure of funds that the Director feels is necessary for the proper performance of our function. But they will not commit themselves on that without a formal submission of the problem. So we have drafted a submission and it is ready to come to you [indicating Colonel White] but, first, we had heard rather informally that the State Department was doing something of this nature, so we asked [redacted] to find out precisely what they were doing, what their basis was, and the authorities, and tie it in with the proposed submission. The indications are we would probably get a favorable answer if the Director puts it very strongly as something he feels is necessary.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I can add to your history, Red, because it came up first last June when the Director was blowing off steam to me about a Station Chief who didn't know the language of the country he was in, and he said, "Why in the world don't we have an incentive plan for learning languages?" And I passed that along to the Director of Training who said it had been considered before but had been nibbled to death by ducks. The Director came back from his trip last fall and he was even more violent on the subject, and I called Baird again. Then it came up about three weeks ago. Congressman [Zablocki] made a trip around the world and his one criticism of us was our lack of language competence among senior men. And each time the Director said to me, "Are we doing something about this?"

Quite frankly, I don't think the problems you mentioned [indicating Colonel White] are insurmountable. I see no reason why the Agency should pay for competence in French, German or Spanish, which are languages you can buy by the hundreds. Furthermore, I might add, I sent to the Director of Training the British

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

incentive plan which they had for many years. They simply make awards when somebody passes their proficiency test, indicating general proficiency in the language, and then pay them on an annual fee basis for maintaining efficiency, and they test them periodically.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is very much like what we are coming up with.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Doesn't Personnel have an IBM record on that, on their proficiency? And we should make them take tests. Most of this self-evaluation that goes on is purely for the birds.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That's it.

× . . . Off the record . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I move that we meet next week on this subject, whether it's an agreed paper or not, and preferably if it's a "not agreed" paper.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's not so unagreed as it was last week.

MR. REYNOLDS: We can have a meeting on next Thursday.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The paper will not be ready until next Tuesday.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All I can say is if we keep on procrastinating with the Director he may well take off one of these days--and I think he will have good reason to. We've been fiddling around for six months on this thing.

COLONEL WHITE: I think, Kirk, we're so close that it might be inadvisable to jump too fast now, if it just means a couple more days. There's no question but these boys are working hard on it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Clyde's entire time during the last three or four days has gone to this.

COLONEL WHITE: There is no doubt they are working hard on it, and I think we will have a good paper to consider.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We can have the final draft by next Thursday--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's get the paper to the members by next Thursday then.

COLONEL WHITE: Fine.

MR. REYNOLDS: We will follow that.

✓ The next and last item is the selection for the various colleges, which is under Tab 4 of your agenda.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Chairman, we had a total of 17 candidates for five schools, and we have a total of 7 slots to fill; in other words, we have 17 candidates to fill seven slots. Well, in the first place, I think the Agency should be ashamed

~~SECRET~~

of itself to nominate only 17 candidates for these senior service schools. Either the service schools are worthy of the Agency sending people to or we shouldn't waste our time going through this. I think the schools are well worthwhile. In the second place, I don't see why we should waste the time of the esteemed Selection Panel to boil down 17 to 7, because I think this Board could do it just as well.

I don't know, quite frankly, Red, what we can do about getting more 25X1A9a candidates, but I think, Ken [indicating Dr. ██████████], the DD/P was well served by the fact they put up six for the National War College and didn't get one to any school, and I think they had it coming.

25X1A9a MR. ██████████: This DD/I group is a distillation of many more.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How many more?

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: I should think at least ten more.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How many in the distillation of DD/P? Are those the only candidates?

25X1A9a DR. ██████████ I don't honestly know.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How about DD/S?

COLONEL WHITE: I don't know. I would say this, that in the case of the Industrial College or the National War College I have been putting my money on a candidate or two, rather than to encourage dozens of people to apply. I may be wrong in that. And, also, for the Harvard Business School. I think perhaps I am wrong in not making a more determined effort to get people to some of the other colleges. I still go back to the meeting we had several months ago where I left the Council meeting with the definite impression that in the future we were going to look down and, on a career basis, say, "This is the man that should go to the National War College" or some other place, rather than to say, "Anybody who wants to go put in your application." I may be wrong on that, but I left with the very definite

25X1A9a feeling that is what we wanted to do. You may remember, ██████████ 7, it was at a time when we were, again, up against the deadline on Harvard, etc. So I have been trying to handle mine primarily on the basis of picking a good candidate, rather than to encourage large numbers to apply.

25X1A9a MR. ██████████: As I recall it, the Defense Colleges Selection Panel was set up for the very purpose of searching through the Agency to find the right people who might not have applied.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Did they?

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: I don't believe they did.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In the case of [REDACTED] he simply applied for it and here he is.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, Mr. Reynolds, that after we get through this particular exercise today, I move that at the next meeting of the Career Council we settle down and figure out how we are going to select candidates for these schools, because I don't think we are getting anywhere with this system we're using today, where they come up themselves. Some of them want a rest, and some are interested, and some don't have an assignment.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: This is a combination of all--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But it's not a combination of good management.

MR. REYNOLDS: Would you favor a quota? Saying each one of the major components shall come up with "x" numbers of candidates?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think what I would favor, and I'd like to see a proposal formulated--perhaps by this very same Selection Panel--although Baird's out of town, but maybe the other three could do it--indicating a better form of choosing the right people to go. Because I consider, for example, that not just the National War College but the service colleges, and the Staff College, and the Industrial College, are: (1) not only an opportunity to educate our people in how the military do things--and I must say that I still don't think we are very well educated in that line; but, secondly, a chance to show the military that all of our people don't have two heads, horns and wear cloaks and daggers, and that we do make sense and can get along with the other services. I don't know which is more important, but I think they are equally important. Because we have a chance at the War College, for example, to sell to the future Generals, Admirals and Air Marshalls the fact that here is a competent service with highly professional people that they're going to be working with. The same is true at the individual service schools, showing to the future staff chiefs in senior headquarters the same thing. And yet the one service, the Clandestine Service, where it is needed most, comes up with zero as far as people to go to the three service schools is concerned, where, Ken, your people are going to be cheek by jowl with these fellows in [REDACTED] and in war planning in [REDACTED] for the next umpteen years, 25X1A6a until either somebody drops a flag or we go into a peace business.

5X1A6a

MR. REYNOLDS: I hate to make the comment, Kirk, but it has come up before that for Norfolk and Carlisle Barracks they're not popular because they have to move out of Washington. Therefore, I think you have to have a quota and order them to go.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I was under the impression when people signed up for Career Service they would go where the Agency wanted them to go. And I never thought Carlisle Barracks was so terrible, or Norfolk so terrible.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is what you get, unfortunately.

COLONEL WHITE: Either one is within commuting distance for the weekend, if you don't want to move there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not only that, Red, but I think it's a privilege for people to go to these schools. They are darn good assignments, and if the individual has any intellectual curiosity at all, it's bound to do him some good; and if he doesn't have any intellectual curiosity then it's wrong for us to send him. But I think we have procrastinated with this issue long enough, and I think we ought to join it.

COLONEL WHITE: I agree. Certainly we can improve upon the present system. I wouldn't exclude anyone who wants to volunteer, but I think the emphasis should be the other way around, that "We think this man should go because it fits his career pattern."

MR. REYNOLDS: That is the way I feel.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Ours is a combination of both. We invite each office to send out the word, and then we weed them out, and in three cases we have reached out and picked them.

25X1A9a DR. [REDACTED]: It isn't just a question of volunteering, but we are trying to develop here a career.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: For example, in the DD/P area you might well have a guy 5X1A6a who is today in [REDACTED] that really should go, and I would see no reason why he 25X1A6a shouldn't be brought home from [REDACTED] to go to these schools. So you should be selecting from your entire service, not just from those in Washington who are available and worrying about their next assignment or looking for a year off.

25X1A9a DR. [REDACTED]: That is why I say it has to be both, and you can't cut the volunteers off.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And I would say further, and this comes under the subject of new business, but this is the key part of career planning, and when, say, [REDACTED] 25X1A9. 5X1A9a [REDACTED] decides to go to the War College, that is going to shape his career for the rest of the time he's in the Agency, and, by gosh, when an assignment comes up with a military planning group then we have a man who went to the War College and so he's the No. 1 man for the assignment, because he knows naval procedures or Army regulations,

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

or whatever you want.

MR. REYNOLDS: Will it be in order, therefore, Kirk, if we direct this panel to meet again and come up with a plan for the Career Council meeting on 1 March 1956 for a new proposal for the selection of these candidates?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I so move.

COLONEL WHITE: Second.

. . . This motion was then passed . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: We will proceed now to the actual selection of these people under Tab 4 of the agenda. There are two candidates named, and three alternates, for the National War College, and so on down through the line.

What is your pleasure, gentlemen?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'd like to see if Von could answer a question on the National War College. I don't disagree with the nominees. I think they are excellent.

5X1A9a And I think [REDACTED] by all means should go this year, and I know [REDACTED] should 25X1A9a benefit by it and is a good, natural candidate because in ONE he deals with the

5X1A9a military services. And [REDACTED], too, has good reason to go, as a General Counsel man.

But I wonder about the next two, because going through the DD/P nominees I would put

x them pretty well toward the bottom. For example, I would think [REDACTED], who has just 25X1A9 come from a station chief job where he was dealing with all three services, is a logical candidate. I certainly would put him No. 1 in the alternates.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I could tell you what we said at the gathering, and

5X1A9a General [REDACTED], of course, was there. This represents General [REDACTED]'s view--the 25X1A9a

DD/P representative--this is the way he rated them, and that was the way I had rated

them from the paper reading before going to the meeting, and there was practically

no dissension at all in this selection within the DD/P. I am handicapped by not

25X1A9a knowing the people, but I remember on [REDACTED], particularly, General [REDACTED] did not--25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Was [REDACTED] reflecting the DD/P Career Board or his personal views?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: He said he had talked to I believe [REDACTED], and had 25X1A9a talked to the members of the Board before he came, so it was not a personal matter on his part, it was an agreed position.

5X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, what you are actually doing, in effect--for example, 25X1A9a [REDACTED] is 41 and [REDACTED] is 44, and they are pretty well out of the zone of consideration this year.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] We discussed that point and decided the other factors were overbearing in this case.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Of course, they weren't even considered for the other colleges. That is the rough part of it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think if they had been candidates we might have slipped some of these fellows in elsewhere, had they had a multiple choice, but we were told, "No, it's this or nothing."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Maybe in the future there should be candidates for war colleges and the Selection Panel should decide which ones they go to.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is for the panel to work out in their criteria.

MR. REYNOLDS: Any further comments on this National War College group, or are you ready for the question?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I didn't get a complete text here in my agenda.

COLONEL WHITE: Well, I don't know [REDACTED], 25X1A9

25X1A9a except from these papers here. I know [REDACTED] and I think highly of him. But assuming the Career Boards have considered these people and these are their nominees, I would move that we approve the slate as recommended by the Panel.

. . . This motion was then seconded and passed . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: Now for the Army War College.

COLONEL WHITE: Mr. Chairman, may I request that we discuss the Industrial College first, because it has a bearing on my feelings about this.

MR. REYNOLDS: All right - on page 2.

25X1A9a . . . Messrs. Houston and [REDACTED] retired from the meeting . . .

COLONEL WHITE: I'd like to speak to that. I know the No. 1 candidate, as recommended by the panel, very well indeed, and have a very high regard for him, and have worked with him for four years. He is an outstanding employee and has made a real contribution and is deserving of some kind of reward, and I assume he is probably at the top of his promotion bracket--I don't know--and I certainly would not voice a negative vote toward his going to the Industrial College.

From two standpoints, however, there is a question in my mind. First of all, Wally is not the ambassador type. He is an engineer, a technician, and a very good one. He is not the type of man who is right up on his current events, and so forth. I'm not sure that he would be the best ambassador that the Agency might send, and I don't think that is of prime importance at the Industrial College.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

But, more important, is what he would do with this knowledge when he came back. I would assume that in all probability he will be right back where he is now, when he comes back, and for the years to come. I think here again we have a man who in many ways fits the action we took in the case of [REDACTED]. It might be more 25X1A9e rewarding to him and it might be more rewarding to the Agency to arrange some good special post-graduate course at a good engineering university or college, especially for him, to increase his knowledge in the field in which he is good, than it would to send him to the Industrial College or the Armed Forces colleges. And if he isn't chosen I would urge that something like that be considered, because the man has saved the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of monitoring equipment, and he deserves to be rewarded.

Naturally, I have a selfish interest in the first alternate, who is in the Logistics Office, and he is a bright comer--he is now and would be when he returns--in a field where I think the return to the Agency would be far greater than

25X1A9ait would in the case of [REDACTED].

I throw those comments out for consideration.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Colonel White, may I say that in this case we did bear somewhat in mind the disparity in age, and as Wally is close to the end of his rope and has had nine years here, we thought he was an excellent candidate--there was no question about that. We did feel Wally would get something out of it on his job. He is more than just an engineer, he is out dealing with the industrial world in designing and keeping up with his technical trade, and this of course had a bearing on his job.

COLONEL WHITE: But a remote bearing. I honestly feel that to go to some special course in electrical engineering, which he already has his degree in--I don't care if you want to send him around on a 6-month tour to consult with engineering firms in the country and brush elbows with them, but my point is that is his field and he is good at it, and he is going to be on that narrow-gauge railroad track, if you want to look at it that way. I would endorse anything you want to do to reward

25X1A9a [REDACTED], but the Industrial College goes across the board. It is true he would get something out of it, because he is the kind of fellow who would work at it--there is no question about that. I don't mean I want to knock him as a candidate, because he is a fine, deserving fellow, but there is a question whether there isn't a better way to reward him.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with Red completely. I know [REDACTED] well, and it 25X1A9e

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a would seem a 6-month detail of [REDACTED] to RCA would be far more rewarding all the way across the board than the Industrial College, because [REDACTED] is never going to get 25X1A9a out of the communications field. That is his field and he is going to stick to it. It would probably take no more than a phone call by Mr. Dulles to David Sarnoff to arrange that.

MR. REYNOLDS: Or Bell Labs.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: He does a lot of that already. He's around in the industry as part of his job. Wally feels and we felt that a little broadening experience here, such as the Industrial College, would be good for him and good for the Agency. He can rub elbows with anybody in the industry anytime he wants to, and does it all the time, and to send him down that path again wouldn't give him the little extra broadening and experience that the College would. That was our thinking.

COLONEL WHITE: I'm sure it would broaden him, there is no question about that. But I would lean toward Kirk's suggestion, though, because [REDACTED] is around, 25X1A9a I know, and he has been around, but it isn't a concentrated dose, and, unless things have changed a lot in the last four or five years, it isn't brushing elbows on too high a level in the industry.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Has anything happened on [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have all agreed on it, and Bob Amory has agreed on it. We are even talking about a Carnegie Fellowship, either that or his own personal desire, which is to go to the University of Washington to a management course.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then I would move that [REDACTED] be the Army 25X1A9a War College, and [REDACTED] be the Industrial College man, and that we direct that some- 5X1A9a thing be worked out for [REDACTED] that is more specialized. I really do think, Von, 5X1A9a there is no question about [REDACTED]'s deserving a reward, as Red says, but I do think we are sending a specialist to a general school when we talk about the Industrial 5X1A9a College, and probably [REDACTED] would benefit more than [REDACTED], and you would still get 25X1A9a your man to a specialized school, so that the DD/I doesn't suffer, and I think the Agency benefits. So I'll make that in the form of a motion.

MR. REYNOLDS: You have heard the motion, gentlemen, which I will rephrase 25X1A9a to make sure I understand it, that [REDACTED] be given an assignment similar to that 5X1A9a which this Council voted for [REDACTED], and that [REDACTED] be named as the Industrial 25X1A9a College selection, with [REDACTED] as an alternate, and that [REDACTED] be 25X1A9a named for the two Army War College quota. Is that correct?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

. . . This motion was then seconded and passed . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: The Naval War College?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I move they be accepted as here recommended, and also for the Air War College.

. . . This motion was then seconded and passed . . .

MR. REYNOLDS: Any new business to come before the meeting?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have one item of new business.

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully submit that this Council ought to pay more attention to career planning. People on my Staff talk to anywhere from two to three hundred employees of the Agency per month, in the course of their inspections, and if there is any one aspect of Career Service on which there is frequent and woeful comment by employees, it's on the subject of career planning. So in order to join this issue, I would move that at an early meeting of the Career Council we receive a presentation analyzing what is done, in the various components, on the subject of career planning, so that we can take a careful look at it and decide if sufficient is being done or if further steps should be taken to improve career management in the Agency.

25X1A9a MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. [REDACTED] has scheduled for 1 March 1956, these items: Individual Career Planning, and Career Development Programming--in view, I think, of the conversation he had with you, and if we can get it done in time, would that be satisfactory with you?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And I thought [REDACTED]'s paper, which Dick asked be 25X1A9a discussed with the Council--

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, [REDACTED]'s paper is off here [indicating arm's length] and I want to get dead center on this. In the first place, I don't think it is very practical. But I am interested in the fact that I think one of the reasons we are missing the boat is that we are doing fine on career planning at the junior officer level, and then on the big middle-echelon level, up through 15's, why there is none, and we simply have to get at it.

MR. REYNOLDS: Any further business, gentlemen?

With Mr. Kirkpatrick's new business, and this item - Proposal for action on Promotion, Assignment and Identification of Positions with Career Services - for the 16 February meeting, that will probably take up the whole meeting.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] In November the Council approved these principles, and this

~~SECRET~~

is the implementing mechanism for getting this thing airborne, which will be ready by the 16th of February.

MR. REYNOLDS: Final studies have been completed on these three inter-related matters which will implement the policies approved by the Career Council on 10 November 1955, and subsequently by the Director.

COLONEL WHITE: There is one item that I would like to mention that is kind of suspended in mid-air at the moment. When we discussed the Fitness Report--I don't know what the minutes show, but my understanding was that the Council said that insofar as supergrades are concerned it is none of our business and this is a question for the Supergrade Board, although the Regulation provides that in the case of supergrades it can be either by memo or by use of the Fitness Report. I think we have an obligation to present that to the Director. I think it would be very simple--just a memo from you [indicating Mr. Reynolds], as the Chairman of this Council, saying that is the way the Board felt. I don't know whether or not the Director and General Cabell would buy that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Just a memo from you advising the Director this is what the Council recommended?

COLONEL WHITE: And asking his approval.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] What the Council decided, which I believe the minutes show, and reflected in the Fitness Report Regulation, which is in your hands [indicating Colonel White], is that it is optional with the supervisor as to whether to use the Fitness Report form or a memorandum type of evaluation.

MR. REYNOLDS: Very well. I will have such a memorandum drawn and sent to the Director for his approval. Very good. That will be prepared.

Any further business? If not, the meeting stands adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. . . .

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~ATTACHMENT 1

COMPETITIVE AREA - WORLD-WIDE

× Competitive Level - Admin Assistant GS-9

Category	Veteran	Non-Veteran	Total Yrs Service in Govt	
I	A		5	[Permanent Employee - Veteran - Member of Career Staff - 5 yrs total service]
I		B	8	[Permanent Employee - Non-Veteran Member of Career Staff - 8 yrs total service]
II	A		11	[Trial Period Employee - Veteran Not Member of Career Staff - 11 yrs total service]
II	A		9	[Permanent Employee - Veteran - Not Member of Career Staff because not eligible or declined membership - 9 yrs total service]
II		B	12	[Trial Period Employee - Non- Veteran - Not Member of Career Staff - 12 yrs total service]
II		B	10	[Permanent Employee - Non-Veteran Not Member of Career Staff because not eligible or declined membership - 10 yrs total service]
III				[Temporary Employees]

25X1A9a

[Above diagram was used by [REDACTED]
in his oral presentation on "Reduction in
Force in relation to Membership in the
Career Staff" at 17th Meeting of CIA Career
Council. See pp. 2 thru 7 of verbatim
transcript of meeting.]

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

260156

SEVENTEENTH CIA CAREER COUNCIL MEETING

DOC	2	REV DATE	24/06/81	BY	018995
ORIG COMP	-	OPI	32	TYPE	01
ORIG CLASS	5	PAGES	55	REV CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2011	AUTH:	HR 70-2

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Officer designations should be used in the "TO" column. Under each comment a line should be drawn across sheet and each comment numbered to correspond with the number in the "TO" column. Each officer should initial (check mark insufficient) before further routing. This Routing and Record Sheet should be returned to Registry.

FROM:

TELEPHONE

NO.

Executive Secretary, CIA Career Council *JB* 2888

DATE

TO

ROOM
NO.

DATE

REC'D

FWD'D

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

TELEPHONE

COMMENTS

1.

Gen. Cabell

*②**1/19**1/23**CP*

2.

*Exec Secy,
CIA Career Council*

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attached for your information is
the Agenda for the 17th Meeting of
the CIA Career Council which is
scheduled for 26 January 1956.

9 February

18

2